REMARKS

Reconsideration of the above-identified application is respectfully requested.

Claim 5 has been amended to obviate any indefiniteness. No change in scope is made or intended.

Claims 1–7, 10, and 11 were rejected as anticipated by Ranganath et al. Independent claims 1 and 10 recite controlling the frequency of the alternating current in accordance with a varying component of the rectified mains voltage. The Ranganath et al. patent discloses in the abstract, for example, that "*The inverter, which can be self oscillating or driven from a control circuitry, can give higher frequency, high voltage AC output with ability to control the load power hence provide for dimming, e.g. for a fluorescent lamp.*" There is no disclosure or suggestion of controlling the frequency of alternating current in accordance with a varying component of the mains voltage.

The Examiner relies on column 2, lines 14–31, quoted below.

> "The invention provides an electronic ballast for a fluorescent lamp which utilizes switches and operates in buck boost mode. The term buck boost is known to those skilled in the art as relating to circuitry wherein output voltage can be either higher than or lower than input voltage. A problem associated with switch rating in the buck boost regulator is removed by using two switches in series wherein the second switch can also be the bottom switch of half bridge inverter.
>
> "The invention employs AC to DC conversion using buck-boost topology. During this conversion from AC to DC, because inductor current is always maintained to be discontinuous, the filtered input current should follow the input voltage. The output inverter is a half-bridge driven inverter with a tuned L-C output circuit. The ballast circuit employs two stage conversion. but with single control element. During the absence of the load the operation of the inverter can be interrupted by means of duty cycle control and thus avoid unnecessary loss in the output circuit. "

There is not a single word in the quoted text about controlling the frequency of the alternating current in accordance with a varying component of the rectified mains voltage. How can there be anticipation?

Claims 8 and 9 were rejected as unpatentable over Ranganath et al. The rejection is not understood; specifically, it is not known what is intended by "the general conditions of a claim." As shown above, the Ranganath et al. patent does not remotely disclose or suggest the invention. Therefore, the "general conditions of a claim," whatever they are, are not disclosed in the prior art.

There is no question of optimization. The Ranganath et al. patent says nothing about the magnitude of the varying component of the rectified mains voltage. One cannot optimize nothing.

In view of the foregoing amendment and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1–11 are in condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Paul F. Wille

Paul F. Wille
Reg. No. 25,274
Attorney for Applicant

Philips Intellectual Property & Standards
P.O. Box 3001
Briarcliff Manor, N.Y. 10510–8001
(914) 333–9634